

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/764,235	<b>Applicant(s)</b> O'MAHONY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Agnes B. Rooke	<b>Art Unit</b> 1653	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Agnes B. Rooke.

 (2) Monshipouri, Maryam.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (3) Dermott J.M.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 26 April 2006
**Time:** 10:00 AM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*See part II below*

Claims discussed:  
 2, 7, 8, 11, 14, 19, 23, 26

Prior art documents discussed:  
*no*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Agnes Rooke  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: There are several issues that must be addressed in the claims before the application is placed in condition for allowance: 1) claims 7, 8, and 11 cannot be rejoined at this instance because methods itself lack necessary steps and thus would be rejected under 35 USC 112(2), and also claim 11 broadens the scope of the claim by referring to "the animal" where the specification has support only for "the rat".

Claim 14 should be re-written as to correctly refer to "a peptide" in claim 2.

Claim 19 should be cancelled since it is identical to claim 2.

Claim 23 requires a new search for the D-form retroinversion of SEQ ID NO:24.

Claim 26 lacks support in the specification for the "viral DNA."